gress which are more and more being absorbed by the executive branch.

In addition, there are other ways by which the power and authority of the legislative branch have been diminished. It is not our object to enumerate these abuses here but, recognizing their existence, to propose means for correcting them.

We believe the best means would be creation of the Committees of Procedures and Policies in the House and Senate, headed by members of the minority party.

In both Houses of Congress are Committees on Government Operations having jurisdiction to conduct comprehensive investigations. It is difficult for them to do so effectively when the results appear likely to reflect unfavorably on their own party's administration. This is the purpose of giving control of these committees to the minority.

This is not an original idea in representative government either here or abroad. The House of Commons in Great Britain has a committee known as the Committee of Public Accounts whose chairman is by convention a leading member of the opposition, usually a person who has been Financial Secretary of the Treasury. The committee is charged with responsibility for insuring that all public money is spent in the manner intended by Parliament. It also promotes economy and efficiency and helps to maintain high standards of morality in all public financial matters.

In our own history also, there are examples of minority control of committee investigations. Perhaps the most famous occurred in 1923 when the Teapot Dome oil-reserve investigation was conducted by a Democratic Senator at a time when both Houses of Congress and the executive branch were controlled by the Republican Party. This Senator, Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, accepted the responsibility of conducting the investigation at the urgent request of Republican Senator Robert LaFollette.

These committees would infringe in no way upon the majority's power to conduct its own investigations. The new committees would help only to reveal areas in which Government was not serving the American people as well as it should. . . .

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS MR. MUNDT

There are numerous recommendations in the joint committee's report which, if adopted by the Congress, will lead to substantial improvement in congressional procedures. . . .

I do feel however, that the report does not delve deeply enough into the fundamental question of preserving the traditional check and balance system of our government. Everyone knows that the executive branch increasingly has encroached upon the powers of the Congress. We might have created a mechanism which would help assure a better check and balance system. I believe we might have looked more closely at proposals which would have provided a sort of watchdog committee on procedures and policies which would be chaired in each House by Members of the minority party. This would give greater assurance that partisanship would not prevent or modify complete scrutiny by the Congress of the executive branch, especially when both Houses of the Congress, as well as the Executive, are controlled by the majority party. Surely it would give far greater assurance that the public would be given the full truth in matters such as the Bobby Baker scandal. This is a parliamentary tool which the British have found to be very effective through the operation of what they call "The Committee of Public Accounts" which is controlled by the minority. . . .

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES E. WEBB

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a statement of James E. Webb of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency on the future of the space program for fiscal year 1969.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I include the above-mentioned statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: We are here today to present to the Committee the President's authorization request for NASA's Budget for Fiscal Year 1969, a year that marks the beginning of NASA's second decade.

For the past seven years, Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., first as Associate Administrator and then as Deputy Administrator, has played a principal role in presenting the NASA program to the Committee. All of us at NASA deeply regret the loss of his services as a full-time official, but we are glad that he has agreed to continue on a part-time basis as a consultant.

The President last week submitted to the Senate the appointment of Dr. Thomas O. Paine of Santa Barbara, California, to succeed Dr. Seamans. Dr. Paine has achieved a distinguished record in many technical fields including metallurgy and magnetism. Equally important, he is experienced in the field of management. His most recent post was as Manager of General Electric's Center for Advanced Studies. Here he was responsible for a substantial effort in research and analytic studies on complex problems of military systems and on broad technological and social problems of a national and international character. Thus NASA is able to draw on an outstanding technically and scientifically oriented executive from private life to enrich the high competence of its career service. Dr. Paine will be available for duty in about a month.

Dr. Homer Newell, as Associate Administrator, is concentrating on a number of special assignments centering on an analysis of policy and planning needs for the next ten years. Since the position of Deputy Administrator is temporarily vacant, and in view of Dr. Newell's current assignment, I have asked the Associate Administrators for Space Science and Applications, for Tracking and Data Acquisition, for Advanced Research and Technology, and for Manned Space Flight to present NASA's 1969 budget requests. They will testify not solely as the managers of the four major program offices, but as officials responsible for and participating in the conduct of the total NASA program including the areas of over-all management and public policy. Statements covering a number of specialized areas have been supplied by other officials.

With your permission, my own statement will be limited to a few important points which will be developed further by the Associate Administrators.

1. NASA's 1969 authorization request, at the $4,370 million level, is $700 million below the amount requested last year. It is almost $500 million less than this year's authorization and is $200 million below this year's appropriation. NASA's expenditures for FY 1969 will be down $230 million from this year, $850 million below last year, and $1.3 billion less than in FY 1966. The NASA program has been cut. I hope you will decide it has been cut enough and will approve the full amount recommended by the President.

2. The FY 1969 request does not meet all our Nation's needs in aeronautics and space. It is a compromise—one which I fully support—between needed work toward advances in aeronautics and space which we can and should make, and other overriding requirements. The President was forced, in spite of his conviction as to the importance of a larger effort in aeronautics and space research, to accept reductions in NASA's budget as submitted for FY 1968 and to recommend in this 1969 budget an even lower level.

3. During this period when we are reducing our effort by one-third, the USSR is still increasing its effort. We must therefore face the probability that in the coming year, and in those following, the Soviets will continue to demonstrate capabilities beyond those which we will have. They will soon be in position to launch a booster with greater thrust than the Saturn V. I expect them to resume manned space flights soon. They may well land instrument package on Mars in 1969 and again in 1971. In terms of scientific advance and in applications of immediate economic use, such as meteorological and communications systems, our program has contributed more than theirs. But in terms of the use of large launch vehicles and in the rate at which future greater capabilities are being developed, they are and will remain ahead, at our 1969 Budget level. The hard fact we now face is that just as we have begun to catch up in large-scale booster operations—as shown by the flights of Apollo 4 and 5 and the bringing of Launch Complexes 34, 37 and 39 on stream—we are cutting back our program while they continue to advance.

Within the necessary fiscal constraints, the NASA FY 1969 program and budget estimates are based on the following guidelines:

First, we will continue with the Apollo program on the schedule we presented to this Committee in its hearings on our 1968 operating plan. A manned lunar landing by the end of 1969 depends on success in practically every one of the eight Saturn V flights remaining in our operational plan for 1968 and 1969. Our schedules and our budget estimates are based on success in utilizing the all-up test concept for both the Saturn V and Apollo. At the 1969 Budget level, our ability to promptly overcome any serious problems which our test launches may show is greatly reduced.

Second, we will reduce production rates under space systems contracts and our NASA center operations in order to hold expenditures to a minimum in FY 1968 and FY 1969. The delivery rate of Saturn IB's after the first 12 and of Saturn V's after the first 15 will be reduced to two per year. We are also carefully analyzing with the Department of Defense future requirements for large launch vehicles and will consider furtherr will be scheduled until after the first manned lunar landing, and the number of launches will be sharply limited. A number of new studies will focus on definition of a *Saturn V Workshop* as the major follow-on use of the Saturn-Apollo capability we have developed for initial use in the manned lunar landing. The Saturn I Workshop will be considered as an interim step toward the Saturn V Workshop. The earliest launch of the Saturn I Workshop will be in 1970; it will be used in association with a later launch of an Apollo Telescope Mount as we described to you last year. Under our reduced budget, this is a logical step in the development of manned flight in the period following the lunar landing. Practically all programs have been stretched out. For example, in the Physics and Astronomy pro-

gram, the launch schedule for the Pioneer spacecraft has been revised so that there is now a gap of more than three years between Pioneer E and the first of the next two missions, Pioneer F and G.

Third, we are phasing-out a number of flight research projects such as the X-15 and XB-70. We are terminating the orbiting geophysical observatory program after OGO-F now scheduled to be launched early in 1969.

Fourth, those urgent new starts which we must undertake will be reduced in scope. Instead of the large NERVA II nuclear engine proposed last year, we will be developing a smaller NERVA I. This will enable us to greatly increase the future capability of the Saturn V launch vehicle, but will not require the construction of extensive engine development and test facilities. In the planetary program, in place of the Voyager mission, we are now proposing an extended use and expansion of the less costly Mariner class spacecraft. This program includes Mars missions in 1971 and 1973.

Fifth, in aeronautics and in space applications we will undertake certain urgent activities in an expansion of current levels. In aeronautics, technology developed in space programs is now able to make important contributions to the improvement of aircraft. We will devote increased effort to noise reduction and the development of vertical and short take-off and landing aircraft. We will increase our experimental work in the utilization of space systems for direct application and related economic benefit. For example, Nimbus D, planned for 1970, offers a major step forward in charting the vertical structure and composition of the Earth's atmosphere. We will enlarge with other Federal agencies an aircraft program to experiment with techniques and instruments for remote measurement of earth resources. We will also start definition studies of a future satellite system for acquiring data on earth resources.

Sixth, we are reassessing our NASA Center work assignments and organization as our work force is reduced. Our objective is to retain in our research and development centers, after the reductions are made, a limited but strong and well-balanced team of scientists, engineers, program and project managers. In our work with industrial contractors and universities, where employment on NASA work is down by 135,000 and is still dropping at a rate of about 4,000 per month, we plan to develop new ways through which the supporting research and technology funds in our contracts and an extension of step funding of university projects can help stabilize the operations on which the nation's most experienced scientific and technical teams depend. In all these actions, we are emphasizing the continuing need for basic research and basic work in technology to ensure that we will continue to strengthen our national resource base and have the ability to move forward again on a firm basis in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would now like to call on Dr. Naugle and then Mr. Truszynski.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, Thursday, February 8.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FRIGHAN (at the request of Mr. BLANTON), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. BLANTON), for 60 minutes, on February 20; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROVER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KARTH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BELCHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and Mr. ALBERT in the body of the RECORD following the President's message on crime.

Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURPHY of New York following the President's message on crime and to include pertinent extraneous material.

Mr. MACGREGOR following the remarks of Mr. MORTON and to include a newspaper article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 1, 1968.

(The following Members, (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYATT.
Mr. RHODES of Arizona.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in five instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. DENNEY.
Mr. ESHLEMAN.
Mr. BERRY in two instances.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. BLACKBURN.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. TEAGUE of California.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. MAILLIARD.
Mr. TAFT in four instances.
Mr. ROTH in five instances.
Mr. MCDADE.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts.
Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLANTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. EVANS of Colorado.
Mr. FISHER in four instances.
Mr. MACHEN in six instances.
Mr. MCFALL in two instances.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. MOORHEAD in four instances.
Mr. RARICK in two instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. ST GERMAIN in two instances.
Mr. STEED.
Mr. EILBERG in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. COHELAN in two instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
Mr. FASCELL in three instances.
Mr. MARSH in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.
Mr. CAREY.
Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. KARTH.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. HANNA in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1482. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting the report of Federal contributions program equipment and facilities for the quarter ending December 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(1) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1483. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on December 31, 1967, puruant to the provisions of section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1484. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to provide technical and financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of the Wholesale Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1968; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1727. An act to authorize the consolidation and use of funds arising from judgments in favor of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and of each of its constituent groups (Rept. No. 1087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2402. An act to provide for credit to the Kings River Water Association and others for excess payments for the years 1954 and 1955 (Rept. No. 1088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2447. An act to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (Rept. No. 1089). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1058. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 25, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wild-

from any puny upstart? Must we retreat from the high seas as a maritime nation?

The *Pueblo* capture was stated, of course, as a diversionary tactic to draw attention from the new Communist aggression in Vietnam, can South Vietnam now believe, in view of the diplomatic retreat about the *Pueblo*, that we will not sell them out to obtain the release of more than 800 airmen held by North Vietnam? And if we lie about the *Pueblo*, what rationale can we use to tell North Vietnam we are all they claim if this will obtain the release of our men?

The answer of course is national security, integrity and honor. This is why we are fighting in Vietnam. This is why the gallant *Pueblo* took risks off Korea and this is why we maintain a defense posture.

That posture should not be used to perpetrate a lie even for ultimately good motives such as the release of prisoners.

Once we resort to the lie as a national policy we are no different from the enemy we are fighting. We will have lost our national integrity.

Mrs. Carlos Romulo

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we were deeply saddened recently to learn of the passing of one of America's warmest friends, Mrs. Carlos P. Romulo.

Mrs. Romulo exemplified the noblest traditions of womanhood as a wife, a mother, and a talented, well-educated, warmhearted, gracious lady. We remember Mrs. Romulo most pleasantly during her years in Washington when her husband served as Philippine Ambassador to the United States. When living in New York while General Romulo served as President of the United Nations General Assembly, Mrs. Romulo continued a tradition of service begun many years before in the Philippines. She will be greatly missed by all who knew her, and her circle of friends extends the world over.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in deepest sympathy to General Romulo and their three sons, Gregorio, Ricardo, and Roberto.

I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the following article about Mrs. Romulo which appeared in the Washington Post:

MRS. ROMULO DIES IN MANILA—WIFE OF EX-AMBASSADOR HERE

Virginia Llamas Romulo, 62, wife of the long-time Philippine Ambassador to the United States and former president of the United Nation's General Assembly, died of leukemia yesterday in Manila.

A petite island beauty queen, she and her husband, now President of the University of the Philippines, were one of Washington's most popular diplomatic couples during the more than eight years they lived here.

The daughter of a prominent Philippine family, Mrs. Romulo attended convent schools and at 16 won the islands' carnival beauty queen contest. The king chosen to rule beside her was Carlos P. Romulo, a young editor who had recently returned from Columbia University. They were married a short time later.

During World War II, while her husband was serving as aide-de-camp to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Mrs. Romulo and her four children hid in the hills and jungles of Luzon.

With a price put on her head by the Japanese, Mrs. Romulo and her children kept changing identities, which Mrs. Romulo said was dangerous and confusing for her children, the youngest of whom, Bobby, was only 3. Bobby thought up his own answer when Japanese troops asked him "Who is your father?" Mrs. Romulo said. "He would just say 'Daddy,' " she recalled.

After the war the Romulos were reunited and came to the United States. Brig. Gen. Romulo was then resident commissioner of the Philippines. He became U.N. General Assembly president in 1949, and served at the U.N. until 1954 when he was named Ambassador to the United States.

The Romulos owned a house on Garfield Street nw. for many years, renting it while they lived at the Embassy from 1954 to 1962. Mrs. Romulo created a Philippine room in the house, tiled like a Manila patio and filled with rattan furniture, Philippine carvings and her own paintings.

The Romulos returned to Manila in 1962, when the Ambassador became president of the Philippine University. They returned briefly to Washington in 1964 for a visit.

Besides her husband, Mrs. Romulo is survived by three sons, Gregorio, Ricardo and Roberto. A fourth son, Carlos Jr., was killed several years ago in a plane crash.

Serbian Independence

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 we will join Serbians throughout the world in commemorating the revolt for independence from the Turks which was led by the famed Karageorge. Unfortunately, the Serbian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden in their homeland by their present dictator, Tito.

On this historic day we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Serbia and all the other captives of communism.

The great Serbian leader, Karageorge, offered his life and fortune to rid Serbia of the oppressive rule of the Turks and the Serbians were victorious in their fight for independence and freedom. Serbia achieved international recognition when the Treaty of Bucharest was signed in 1812 and secured a limited autonomy.

We must not only observe historic events such as the Serbian fight for independence in words, but in deeds as well. I urge, therefore, that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established to study the present conditions of oppression under which the Serbians and other captive peoples are suffering.

It is especially important, Mr. Speaker, that we note the consistent cooperation of the Tito government with the Soviet intrusion into the Mediterranean and the growing menace to world peace that stems from this Soviet imperialistic policy.

Our Space Program

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of questions which I asked of the Honorable James Webb, Administrator of NASA, on February 7, 1968, together with Mr. Webb's replies:

QUESTIONS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO ADMINISTRATOR JAMES WEBB, OF NASA, FOR AUTHORIZATION HEARINGS, FEBRUARY 7, 1968

Question I: What is the relative status and progress of our national space program compared to the Soviet space program? Are we ahead or behind? In what areas?

Answer: The Soviet space program has consistently utilized larger boosters than were currently available to the U.S. In the coming year, still larger Soviet boosters will be coming into use. During 1968, or shortly thereafter, they will have available a booster with over ten million pounds of thrust.

The success of the Soviet Venus 4 and the ejection of a sensor capsule into the Venusian atmosphere during its encounter with the planet prove that the Soviets have made great progress in spacecraft command, control, communications, and guidance.

The Venus 4 mission was only one of an impressive list of Soviet firsts, which includes the first satellite in earth orbit, the first lunar orbit, the first pictures of the far side of the moon, the first soft landing on the moon, the first man in space and the first multimanned space vehicle.

Planned Soviet manned space activity has been delayed following the failure of the Soyus-1 mission last spring. However, automatic rendezvous and docking was accomplished by the Cosmos 186 and 188 vehicles. This rendezvous and docking capability now opens the way for the Soviets to proceed with their announced program of large earth orbiting space stations and further exploration of the moon and planets. We believe they have the capability to do a flyby of the moon with some form of life, which some believe could be man. That the Soviets will soon resume manned space operations is indicated by the public announcement of the addition of nine ships to the expeditionary fleet of the Soviet Academy of Sciences for the purpose of research work associated "with observations of space objects in the areas of the Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific Oceans and the Mediterranean Sea."

The Soviets continue to launch, within their Cosmo series, important scientific satellites and others which are recovered within one to eight days. Sixty-one (61) Cosmos satellites were launched in 1967 of which 35 were recovered. Three of the Cosmos vehicles were meteorological satellites. Three Molniya communication satellites, the 5th, 6th and 7th in this program, were launched in 1967.

The Soviet research and development effort in aeronautics continues to increase with indications that its supersonic transport will be flying early next year. Last October, the International Aeronautical Federation was requested to certify a world altitude record of 98,461 feet carrying a 4,400 pound payload. A more recent Soviet news release claims a world speed record of 1817 mph over a 500 km. closed circuit. Both were accomplished with the Soviet E-266 aircraft.

In summary, there were 66 launches in the Soviet space program during 1967. This compares with 42 launches in 1966 and 64

launches in 1965, the previous Soviet peak year.

There are no signs that the Soviets are cutting back their space program as we are. New test and launch facilities are steadily added to expand their resource base and a number of space-flight systems more advanced than any heretofore used are nearing completion. They will soon be in a position to utilize a booster with greater thrust than the Saturn V. They continue to move toward a resumption of manned space flights. There is little doubt that they will endeavor to land instrument packages on Mars in 1969 and again in 1971.

In terms of scientific advances and in applications of space systems to economic use, such as meteorological and communications systems, our program has achieved a more advanced state than theirs. But in terms of capability to use large launch vehicles and in the rate of advance toward future greater capabilities, they are and will remain ahead at the 1969 budget level which we are presenting. The hard fact we now face is that just as we have begun to catch up in large-scale booster operations—as shown by the flights of Apollo 4 and 5—we are sharply reducing our program while they continue to advance.

Question II. Last year, I asked NASA what would be the effect of a reduction of several hundreds of millions of dollars in the Fiscal Year 1968 budget request. The reply was to the effect that the program would experience serious and critical setbacks. Such a cut was eventually made before the appropriation was passed into law. How has it been possible for the space program to maintain its pace in the light of these reductions?

Answer: It has not been possible to maintain the pace of the U.S. space program.

The President's Fiscal Year 1968 budget request included funds to continue to advance in space and to augment our aeronautics effort. It also requested funds to begin a limited number of programs significant for the next decade, including NERVA II; Voyager to be used for scientific missions to Mars in 1973 and 1975 utilizing orbiting vehicles and automated landing laboratories; a Mariner flight to Mars in 1971; and Sunblazer, a small interplanetary probe to increase our knowledge of the Sun. In addition, the President's 1968 request would have maintained production of our largest boosters, the uprated Saturn I and the Saturn V, at four of each per year, with spacecraft to use these boosters for Apollo application missions, beginning as early as this year—1968.

Except for the Mariner-Mars 1971 mission, authorization for each of these programs was approved by Congress, but at reduced levels. The FY 1968 authorization totaled $4.866 billion—$234 million below the budget request. The appropriation at $4.59 billion was $511 million below the budget request and $277 million below the authorization.

Thus, for FY 1968 we are operating under appropriations in which—

Research and Development funds, other than for Apollo are 20 percent below the budget request;

Funds for Construction of Facilities are less than one-half of the budget request; and

Funds for Administrative Operations were reduced to $628 million. This has necessitated a reduction in Civil Service personnel by about 5% and total administrative costs by about 7%.

In the Apollo program, no more than nine Saturn V flights can take place by the end of 1969. These nine flights mark a reduction from the 13 which we proposed at the beginning of last year and the 11 which we still hoped for last spring.

In the Apollo Applications Program, there has been a complete revision of the mission content. Hardware delivery schedules have been stretched out and planned production rates reduced to two Saturn V's and two Saturn IB's per year beginning in Calendar Year 1970. Apollo Applications flight IA has now been dropped, as has the second Apollo Applications cluster of a Saturn I Workshop and Apollo Telescope Mount. Since no funding was provided for Manned Space Flight Advanced Mission Studies, and FY 1967 funds are limited, a considerable reduction has been made in the amount of study effort needed to insure soundly-based decisions as to future manned missions. All these steps represent a sharp decrease in the planned rate of acquisition of manned space flight experience and consequently a sharp decrease in our national capability for space operations

In the Physics and Astronomy program, it has been necessary to cancel the Pilgrim Project and to delay Sunblazer.

The Lunar and Planetary Program was redirected with increased emphasis on technology development to retain a base of competent personnel in a period when no flight mission were to be undertaken. The Voyager program was eliminated. Launch Vehicle Procurement funding was adjusted downward. The GOES D and E missions were dropped, and the ATS F and G and Nimbus E and F schedules were delayed. The broad effect of these reductions is to slow down the return of scientific information about the solar system and to delay the application of advances in space science and technology.

In our Advanced Research and Technology programs, the level of effort in Electronic Systems, Space Vehicle Systems, Basic Research, Space Power and Electrical Propulsion Systems, and Chemical Propulsion has been reduced. The NERVA I nuclear engine has been substituted for the NERVA II engine. In our ability to meet future aeronautics and space needs, the effects of these cutbacks will be felt for years to come.

Reductions in funding for Tracking and Data Acquisition has reduced support of a number of satellites still in orbit and still transmitting useful scientific and technical data. In the Sustaining University Program, facility grants to universities have been all but eliminated and a sharp reduction has been made in the number of new graduate students supported. Reduction in the Technology Utilization program has meant a lessening of our efforts to identify, evaluate and disseminate new technology resulting from NASA programs.

The 50% reduction in Construction of Facilities appropriations required deletion or deferral of most construction projects, most notably the test facilities for the proposed NERVA II Nuclear Rocket and the Sunblazer antenna.

Finally, Civil Service personnel are being reduced by over 1700. We have reduced paid overtime by 35%, travel by 15%, and other costs by 17%.

We can conduct a viable and useful program at these lower levels, as we will indicate in presenting the President's FY 1969 budget, but it will be a sharply reduced one.

Question III: The President's Budget Message (see page 874, Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal Year 1969) states, in part,

"In calendar year 1969, five manned flights of the Saturn V are planned. Plans call for all of these flights to be conducted with complete lunar landing systems. The mission plans for the first four will be primarily aimed at development and operational testing. It is planned that the lunar landing *will* be made using a Saturn V in calendar year 1969."

In view of the reductions made in Fiscal Year 1968 and the reduced budget level of the Fiscal Year 1969 request, is this estimated date for the lunar landing as firm as is implied?

Answer: In the last seven fiscal years, the President's budget requests for NASA have been reduced by over $1.5 billion. The kind of readjustments required by NASA and its contractors have caused grave problems and delays. Notwithstanding this, and such set backs as the Apollo 204 fire last year, we have developed a system that has continued to move forward with the work required, to meet the nation's needs in space. The first all-up Saturn V, flight tested all of its stages, the Service Module propulsion system and qualified the Apollo heat shield at lunar return speed. The recent Apollo 5 tested the Lunar Module and its descent and ascent engines. We are continuing to move rapidly. The President's Fiscal Year 1969 budget request, if approved by Congress, will permit NASA to proceed on a testing, checkout and launch schedule which, barring a major setback, should enable us to fly the ninth Saturn V by the end of calendar year 1969. However, where we have had in previous years some flexibility to work around major problems, we now have almost none. Even in the light of these factors, we believe that we still have the possibility of making the lunar landing before 1970.

Equitable Development of a National Resource

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to insure that resources developed by the public are not used for the exclusive benefit of a few private utility companies. This bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN of Vermont.

Nuclear powerplants have quickly changed from an interesting idea to an established fact. Fifteen nuclear powerplants are presently in operation in the United States. Many more nuclear plants with much greater capacity are planned. It is estimated that by 1980 some 150,000 megawatts of nuclear power capacity will have been built. This will represent over one-third of the Nation's total generating capacity.

Public expenditures contributed substantially to the present technological and economic feasibility of nuclear generating plants. It now appears, however, that private utilities are seeking a monopolistic control over these plants. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 does not contain adequate guidelines for the issuance of licenses for the operation of nuclear plants. It does not insure that the public and cooperative systems will share in the benefits derived from nuclear power. The record is replete with examples of private utilities refusing to cooperate with municipalities and cooperative systems. This record suggests what will happen in the future if adequate safeguards are not established now.

The bill I am introducing today will attempt to insure that a reasonable opportunity exist for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power. The bill amends chapter 10 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide that no person shall be issued a license to construct and operate a nuclear powerplant unless he has granted to other persons engaged in the distribution, transmission, or production of